

## REMARKS

Claims 22-43 are pending in the application.

By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-21 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 22-43 are added. The specification is amended for better consistency with the drawings.

These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his courtesy in the telephone conference of January 22, 2007 with Applicant's undersigned counsel, during which it was agreed that (1) Applicant's counsel would submit an RCE with new claims and a Declaration from Laurence Chang, president and CEO of the assignee of this application, Edge Technologies, Inc., discussing the application of the prior art to the claim language; and (2) the Examiner will call Applicant's counsel if he does not find the new claims to be allowable.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

### Objections to the Claims

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claim 6 was objected to due to use of the phrase "or other functions." This rejection is overcome by the cancellation of claim 6.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 13, 14, 17, and 21 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Orberdorfer. In paragraph 5, claims 6, 7, 12, 16, 18, and 19 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Orberdorfer, and further in view of Pulliam. These rejections are overcome by the cancellation of claims 1-19 and 22. To the extent the Examiner may consider these rejections to be applicable to new claims 22-43, they are respectfully traversed as being based upon references that do not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

The Declaration of Laurence Chang is submitted herewith as discussed with the Examiner on January 22, 2007, and is incorporated by reference in this Response.

In summary, as set forth by Mr. Chang in his Declaration, Smith and Orberdorfer, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest:

- an “enterprise network” or
- “computer network management means” or
- “generating management data concerning monitored operating events of the enterprise network that are in need of correction” or
- “receiving the management data from the plurality of computer network management means,”

among other features of the present invention that were recited in the canceled claims and are recited in the new claims. Smith and Orberdorfer also do not teach or suggest:

- “portal means for providing an interface to the plurality of network management means for:
  - (a) receiving the management data from the plurality of computer network management means of an enterprise network and providing the management data for the plurality of network management means to a client for display to a user” or
- “presenting to a user via the client at least one workflow in response to the at least one detected operating event; and in response to user selection of at least one workflow, using the at least one workflow to correct the monitored operating events that are in need of correction, thereby managing the enterprise network” or
- ““logging the user on to the identified network service with functionality in accordance with predetermined user and role segmentation rules” or
- “the portal means provides the management data in a single user-viewable display screen, regardless of whether the plurality of computer network management means are compatible with each other” or
- “means including a map of user ID and logon password data for each computer network management means that a user is authorized to access for providing the user with single logon functionality, whereby the user does not have to logon separately to each computer network management means” or
- “the management data is provided to a client in a predetermined format in a single user-viewable display screen on a real-time basis, regardless of whether the plurality of computer network management means are compatible with each other”

among other features of the present invention that are recited in the new claims and that replace similar features that were recited in the canceled claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the invention as recited in claims 21-43 is patentable over Smith in view of Orberdorfer and Smith in view of Orberdorfer, further in view of Pulliam; and that the rejections should be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

All objections and rejections have been complied with, properly traversed, or rendered moot. Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for allowance. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative so that this case may receive an early Notice of Allowance. *In addition, as requested by the Examiner during the telephone conference of January 22, 2007, the Examiner is reminded that he agreed to call Applicant's undersigned counsel if this amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance, so that an interview can be conducted with the Examiner.*

Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

Date: 1/23/07

By: 

**Customer No. 00,136**  
400 Seventh Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 638-6666

Allen S. Melser  
Registration No. 27,215

**Attachments:**      **RCE Transmittal**  
                             **Declaration Under 37 CFR § 1.132 of Laurence Chang**  
                             **Petition for Extension of Time**  
                             **Credit Card Payment Form**